

From: [Craig Cooper](#)  
 To: [Christina Walsh](#)  
 Subject: Re: tasc program  
 Date: 01/23/2009 09:23 AM

---

Christina - Great email. Thanks! Craig

=====  
 Craig Cooper  
 Superfund Project Manager  
 U.S. EPA Region 9  
 (415) 947-4148 (ph)  
 (415) 947-3520 (fax)  
 ▼ [Christina Walsh <cwalsh@cleanuprocketdyne.org>](mailto:cwalsh@cleanuprocketdyne.org)

**Christina Walsh**  
**<cwalsh@cleanuprocketdyne.org>**

01/22/2009 04:54 PM

To: Luis Garcia-Bakarich/R9/USEPA/US@EPA  
 cc: Craig Cooper/R9/USEPA/US@EPA, William  
 bowling  
 <williamprestonbowling@yahoo.com>, David  
 Cooper/R9/USEPA/US@EPA  
 Subject: Re: tasc program

Thanks for your quick response, and I appreciate the opportunity. Following are some areas that I am interested in exploring under this program:

1. Geology expertise to understand specifically the chemical vs. radiological differences between the geology determined to be under the site, i.e. Chatsworth and Santa Susana and the surrounding geological formations that might be similar in makeup, i.e. Chico and Tuna Canyon formations with specific attention to the difference at depth vs. surface samples so that we may have a better understanding on how the global nuclear impacts might differ from those found at the SSFL.
2. Historical Document review: Currently DTSC has a small very good team reviewing the documents, but they are truly monumental in size (the documents). It would be helpful to have independent review of all Area IV historical operational and incident records as well as products used so that we can narrow the list of radionuclides expected, based on site history, vs. primordial or global impact releases. Part of this needs to emphasize an educational aspect to help the everyday people who live around the site, gain a better understanding of the issues and debates currently on the table,

so  
that they may weigh in to the decisions that will possibly  
impact  
their futures. In addition, this will help tremendously since  
the  
comment periods are usually just 30 days and the documents are  
thousands of pages of technical data.

3. Groundwater impacts are profound and not well understood.  
Many of  
the experts who have proposed that nothing is moving off the  
site,  
have never been to the site. We would very much appreciate the  
opportunity to have those experts as well as an independent  
review of  
their data so that the migration of the groundwater plume that  
sits  
below the site, can be understood and dealt with.

4. Groundwater options on remediation - a presentation of  
current,  
best of science approaches to VOC as well as tritium  
contaminated  
groundwater so that those options can be understood on an  
unbiased  
level, enabling the public to substantively comment on this  
process  
that they otherwise do not know much about.

5. Expert Interpretation on the previous SSFL Panel Studies so  
that  
the epidemiological studies done on the surrounding communities  
and  
options presented on other epidemiological and health risk  
assessment  
data can be better understood. A gap analysis on the community  
health  
risk assessments done to date so that the public can gain from  
that  
information on an independent level.

6. CERCLA training if you will. In independent review and  
presentation of the differences between the formerly followed  
RCRA  
process and the CERCLA process for feasibility studies and how  
those  
will progress

7. MARSSIM presentation to better understand the MARSSIM process  
and  
how it is normally applied after the fact, as a confirmation  
process,  
vs. how we are using it here as a clean-up protocol.

8. Background studies and how they are used in other areas.  
Understanding the differences between the McLaren Hart study vs.  
the  
process we are currently following, and how we hope to gain more  
from  
this new process.

9. Understanding the differences in the various sampling  
approaches  
for various radionuclides such as Cs137 and Strontium 90 and how  
we  
will find the other radionuclides that may be alpha emitters when  
we  
are doing a gamma survey. Understanding the differences in  
depth  
sampling and statical approaches to the analysis and how they  
might  
vary. We will be presented with a process, and it would be nice  
to  
understand how "universal" that process is vs. how things are  
done,

or have been done in other sites, such as Hanford, Rocky Flats where the topography and process might differ but some of the challenges are the same. What are those differences, and how can we learn from them?

10. Understanding safety practices of today, vs. "back in the day". We have concerns about the current workers and how the hazardous materials will be transported and what those precautions are and should be. Some feel that the impacts are from movement of soil, so that is important to address.

11. What are some possible ways for reducing the time schedule so that the survey can be completed sooner than 2012 so that the overall schedule can be met. What are some time-effective processes that we might change, or re-examine so that we reduce the time that people are exposed to the material? Sampling, does it have to be iterative? or can it be done and stored adequately to meet the needs?

Anyway those are just some initial thoughts for you. Please let me know if these issues are within the guidelines of what you feel you can help us with.

Thanks again for the opportunity to learn more about the process and the SSFL!  
Christina Walsh  
cleanuprocketdyne.org and acmela.org  
ACME Aerospace Cancer Museum of Education  
8189225123 or museum 8187126903

On Jan 22, 2009, at 3:27 PM, Garcia-Bakarich.Luis@epamail.epa.gov wrote:

```
> Hi Christina,
>
> Thank you for expressing your interest in the TASC program. To help
> scope a work plan with our contractors, I would like it if you could
> relate to me areas that you would like for the technical experts to
> focus on; this could include, but is not limited to, the background
> sampling plan, environmental and human health effects of radiological
> materials/releases, documents to review, etc.
>
> Sincerely,
>
> Luis
>
> '``'. . . . .>((((('`-'`'. . . . .>((((('`-'`'. . . . .>((((('`-'`'. . . . .
>
> Luis M. Garcia-Bakarich (SFD-3)
> Community Involvement Coordinator
> 75 Hawthorne St.
> San Francisco, CA 94105
> garcia-bakarich.luis@epa.gov
> Telephone: (415) 972-3237
> Toll Free 1(800) 231-3075
> Fax (415) 947-3528
>
```

>  
 >  
 > Christina Walsh  
 > <cwalsh@cleanupr  
 >  
 ocketdyne.org>  
 > Luis To  
 > 01/14/2009 04:01 Garcia-  
 Bakarich/R9/USEPA/US@EPA  
 >  
 PM  
 > Craig CC  
 Cooper/R9/USEPA/US@EPA,  
 > william bowling  
 >  
 <williamprestonbowling@yahoo.com>  
 >  
 Subject  
 > tasc program  
 >  
 >  
 >  
 >  
 >  
 >  
 >  
 >  
 >  
 >  
 >  
 >  
 > We are very interested in this program and hope we can work  
 > together. All of our work has been based on community  
 outreach and  
 > look forward to an inclusive process that is far and within t  
 he scope  
 > of the agreed issues within these projects (rad study and  
 background  
 > study). Please let me know if I've understood how this can  
 work for  
 > our community. We have a location that features the history of  
 the  
 > site and all the possible tools for educating the public and  
 feel that  
 > using those resources is a critical part of being effective  
 > communicators with the public. As per my discussion with  
 Craig, we  
 > have some ongoing public outreach and we would like to  
 incorporate  
 > into this if possible to maximize usefulness of the program.  
 >  
 > Thanks and we look forward to speaking with you further on the  
 TASC  
 > program for SSFL.  
 >  
 > Christina Walsh  
 > cleanuprocketdyne.org founder/director  
 > ACME Aerospace Cancer Museum of Education co-founder  
 > a project of International Humanities Center  
 http://www.ihcenter.org  
 > made possible by the annenbergfoundation.org for environmental  
 > advocacy through the arts  
 > 8189225123 museum: 8187126903  
 >  
 >  
 >  
 >